

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,250	12/27/2000	Jea-Yong Yoo	2950-0181P-SP	4718
2292	7590 04/08/2004		EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			NARAYANASWAMY, SINDYA	
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHUI	RCH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,		,	2174	9
			DATE MAIL ED: 04/08/200	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

a.l	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/748,250	YOO ET AL.	
7.67.00.7	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sindya Narayanaswamy	2174	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 18 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced a timely filed amendment whit all (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	cation. A proper re-	ply to a cation in
_	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moterned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date on FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE terms on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. \$ 136(a) and the appropriate ex the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in
<ul> <li>1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI</li> <li>2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be</li> </ul>	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal		
		See NOTE belowly	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further		(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note to		rogially raduaing or	simplifying the
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or			
(d)  they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	etion(s):		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request fo application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does No	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-14.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme			
10. Other:	Kristini Supervisory P	Zincaid E KINCAID ATENT EXAMINER CENTER 2100	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)





Application No.

Applicant's arguments regarding independent claims 1 and 9 and the receiving step in which an image is received and displayed is not persuasive.